

10/086,032

MS196129.01/MSFTP335US

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Applicants' representative wishes to express gratitude for the courtesies extended by Examiner Contino during the telephone conversation on January 4, 2005, wherein the Examiner indicated that amendment of the subject claims to further emphasize the fact that the execution engine propagates compensation handlers from outer contexts to inner contexts and exception handlers from inner contexts to outer contexts would more clearly distinguish the claimed invention and the cited document, and place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 1, 13, 18, 23, 31 and 36 have been amended to comport with the Examiner's recommendation. In addition, claims 4, 16, 24-25, 27, 34 and 37 have been cancelled herein, and claims 10, 15 and 26 have been amended to cure minor informalities. A version of all pending claims is found at pages 2-9. Favorable consideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection to Claim 10**

Claim 10 is objected to because of a minor informality. This objection is believed to be moot and should be withdrawn in view of the amendment made herein to claim 10.

**II. Rejection of Claims 15 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 15 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendments made herein to cure the minor informalities elucidated by the Examiner.

**III. Rejection of Claims 1-39 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Davis *et al.* (US 5,870,545). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Davis *et al.* fails to disclose each and every limitation set forth in the subject claims.

10/086,032

MS196129.01/MSFTP335US

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaa Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The *identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicants' claimed invention relates to an error-handling framework for business transactions, wherein the error-handling framework facilitates coordination of invocation of exception and compensation handlers in response to errors. In particular, independent claims 1, 13, 18, 23, 31 and 36, as amended, recite a similar claim limitation: *the execution engine propagates compensation handlers from outer contexts to inner contexts and exception handlers from inner contexts to outer contexts*. It is apparent that the invention as claimed utilizes an execution engine that selectively compensates, according to a set of predefined rules provided by the error-handling framework, units of work upon invocation of an error-handling routine. The set of predefined rules provided by the error-handling framework defines the propagation of error-handling in nested units of work such that a plurality of contexts associated with the plurality of units of work have at least one hierarchical relationship between the respective units of work. Further, based on the established hierarchical relationship, an exception handler and a compensation handler are associated with each respective context in order for the execution engine to propagate compensation handlers from outer contexts to inner contexts, and exception handlers from inner contexts to outer contexts of the hierarchical relationship. *Davis et al.* does not disclose these exemplary aspects of applicants' claimed invention.

*Davis et al.* discloses a system and method for performing flexible workflow process compensation in a distributed workflow management system. The Examiner contends that support for the limitation *the execution engine propagates compensation handlers from outer contexts to inner contexts and exception handlers from inner contexts to outer contexts*, can be found at col. 20, lines 1-20, col. 14, lines 54-61 and col. 21, lines 3-6. Applicants' representative respectfully avers to the contrary. Col. 20,

10/086,032

MS196129.01/MSFTP335US

lines 1-20, discloses that all activities, i.e., forward, compensation and cancel activities, are defined in the same way, and that compensation activities can be used in different places for different purposes. In addition, the indicated passage provides that both process and compensation activities can invoke external applications, and even the same application. Col. 14, lines 54-61, provides that the compensation scheme utilized in Davis *et al.* is log based and thus as a consequence every significant event of process execution, such as node activation and completion, is recorded in a persistent log file which provides substantially all of the runtime information needed for process compensation. Col. 21, lines 3-6, discloses that compensation is effectuated one at a time and in reverse order as logged in the system log file until all compensation within the compensation scope has been accomplished. As is apparent, Davis *et al.* fails to provide an execution engine that propagates compensation handlers from outer contexts to inner contexts and exception handlers from inner contexts to outer contexts. Nowhere in the cited document is such a novel feature elucidated. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the rejection of independent claims 1, 13, 18, 23, 31 and 36, and associated dependent claims, be withdrawn.

10/086,032

MS196129.01/MSFTP335US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin  
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731